

### **REMARKS**

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Claims 14, 16, and 52-60 are currently pending. Claim 54, 55, and 56 are amended.  
Claims 15 and 51 are cancelled.

Upon indication of allowable subject matter, rejoinder of withdrawn claims 41-50 is requested.

The due date for this response fell on a National Holiday. Applicants rely on 37 C.F.R. §1.7 for timely filing of this response.

### ***Rejection - 35 USC § 112***

The Office Action rejects claims 14, 16, and 52-60 under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph for allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement and for failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicants traverse these rejections.

The claimed subject matter is enabled by the present disclosure. Perforce, Applicants' examples described five (5) compositions and methods for making the same that correspond with the recited subject matter. Per the attached declaration of Dr. Jean M Tancrede ("Tancrede Dec."), each of these compositions were prepared and found to have an MFR<sub>(230/2.16)</sub> over 250 dg/min and an MI greater than 78 as recited in pending claims.

As long as the specification discloses at least one method for making and using the claimed invention that bears a reasonable correlation to the entire scope of the claim, then the enablement requirement of 35 U.S.C. §112 is satisfied. *See* M.P.E.P. §2164.01(b). "Reasonable correlation" is not direct, parallel linking or hype-coordination. For example, the specification need not contain an example if the invention is otherwise disclosed in such manner that one skilled in the art will be able to practice it without undue experimentation. *See* M.P.E.P. §2164.02. Proof of enablement will be required for other members of a claimed genus *only* where adequate reasons are advanced by the examiner to establish that a person skilled in the art could not use the genus as a whole without undue experimentation. *See* M.P.E.P. §2164.02 (emphasis added).

The Office Action has not alleged that the Applicants' examples do not bear a reasonable correlation to the scope of the pending claims. Instead, the Office Action argues that methods of

making such neat polymer having an MFR<sub>(230/2.16)</sub> over 250 dg/min and a MI greater than 78 dg/min.

But, Applicants' working examples actually teach how to make compositions corresponding with the recited subject matter, i.e., Examples E, H, I, J, and K. These examples are reasonably correlated with the scope of the claimed subject matter. See Tancrede Dec., p.2. Moreover, Applicants have described the recited subject matter at page 11, lines 13+ (identifying preferred MI endpoints), page 24, line 22 to page 25, line 20 (identifying methods generally, and page 29, lines 10-28 (identifying MFR endpoints).

Applicants request that the present rejections be withdrawn.

***Rejection – 35 U.S.C. §132(a)***

Applicants' proposed amendment to the specification was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §132(a) as introducing new matter to the disclosure. Applicants traverse for the reasons stated above.

Applicants believe this rejection is intertwined with the enablement rejections. The proposed specification amendment was intended merely to make the specification more clear.

***Rejection – 35 USC § 102(e)***

The Office Action rejects claims 14, 16, 52, 56, and 58 under 35 USC § 102(e), as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,407,171 to Agarwal ("Agarwal"). Applicants traverse.

The Agarwal patent does not teach methods of preparing polypropylene-based adhesives prepared with metallocene catalysts in multiple reactors as recited in the amended claims. The Agarwal patent's broad teaching of generic polypropylenes does not teach the claimed subject matter. Moreover, the Agarwal patent does not inevitably lead to the claimed subject matter and accordingly cannot be found to inherently teach the pending claims as amended.

Applicants request that the present rejections be withdrawn.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicants believe that the foregoing is a full and complete response to the Office Action of record. Accordingly, an early and favorable reconsideration of the rejections, and allowance of pending claims 14, 16, and 52-60 are requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge counsel's Deposit Account No. 05-1712, for any fees, including extension of time fees and excess claim fees, required to make this response timely and acceptable to the Office.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 22, 2008

/Stephen Timmins/  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 48,481

Post Office Address (to which correspondence is to be sent):  
ExxonMobil Chemical Company  
Law Technology  
P.O. Box 2149  
Baytown, Texas 77522-2149  
Telephone No. (281) 834-2866  
Facsimile No. (281) 834-2495